

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-13 and 22-30 are pending. The Applicants' attorney has amended claims 4-5, 10, 12 and 28-29. In view of the following, all of the claims are in condition for allowance. If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, then it is respectfully requested that the Examiner schedule a teleconference with the Applicants' attorney to further the prosecution of the application.

Objection to the drawings

The Applicants' attorney disagrees with this objection because the drawings show a first set of ridges having a first portion of a first height and having a second portion of a second height. For example, FIGS. 3 and 4a-4b show a first set of ridges 11 having a first portion 20 (channel region) of a first height and having a second portion 16 (source region) of a second height. As is clearly shown in FIG. 4b, the height of the first portion 20 (channel region) is shorter than the height of the second portion 16 (source region).

In addition, FIGS 3 and 5-6 show wells 8, 36, 42 defined by respective intersections of the ridges 11. By definition, the ridges 11 are raised or elevated structures on the surface of substrate 7. As shown in FIG. 6, the intersections of these elevated ridges 11 define wells 42 disposed on the surface of substrate 7.

Rejection of claims 1 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner requests clarification regarding claims 1 and 28-29. As discussed above (and shown in FIGS. 3 and 4a-4b), claim 1 recites at least one of the ridges 11 having a first portion 20 (channel region) of a first height and having a second portion 16 (source region) of a second height; claim 28 recites at least one of the ridges 11 (source region 16) having a first height and at least another one of the ridges 11 (gate region 22) having a second height; and claim 29 recites at least one ridge 11 in the second set (drain region 18) having a height that is different than a height of a ridge 11 in the first set (gate region 22).

**Rejection of claims 1-10, 12-13 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
unpatentable over Jacobsen et al. (US 6,468,638) in view of Verlinden et al. (US
6,861,136)**

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites wells operable to hold, in a liquid phase, respective conductive polymers that when in a solid phase form circuit devices that can be interconnected to form an electronic circuit.

For example, referring, e.g., to FIGS. 2-6 and paragraphs 17-29 of the present application, wells (8, 36, 42) are operable to hold, in a liquid phase, respective conductive polymers that, after hardening, form circuit devices (e.g., a transistor 14) that can be interconnected (e.g., by a connection layer 9) to form an electronic circuit. It should be noted that the liquid polymer itself forms the circuit devices (after the liquid polymer hardens).

In contrast, Jacobsen does not teach wells operable to hold, in a liquid phase, respective conductive polymers that when in a solid phase form circuit devices that can be interconnected to form an electronic circuit. Instead, Jacobsen teaches solid blocks 14 that are fabricated separately, and then transferred to holes in the substrate 12 by an FSA process (col. 2, lines 6-25). Each solid block 14 is not in a liquid phase and already contains driver circuitry such as a MOSFET and a capacitor (col. 2, lines 14-16). Furthermore, the FSA process of transferring each solid block 14 to holes in the substrate 12 is described in detail in US Patent No. 5,545,291 to Smith et al. In Smith, solid GaAs blocks 19 are etched from a solid GaAs layer 17 and then transferred to recesses 55 in the substrate 50 by the FSA process (FIGS. 1-3 and 6-7). However, this all has nothing to do with a liquid conductive polymer that itself forms circuit devices after hardening.

Similarly, Verlinden does not teach wells operable to hold, in a liquid phase, respective conductive polymers that when in a solid phase form circuit devices that can be interconnected to form an electronic circuit. Instead, Verlinden simply defines an organic light-emitting display (OLED) as a device where electrons and holes are injected from a cathode and anode into an electroluminescent material such as an electroluminescent polymer (col. 8, lines 6-10). However, this common definition of an OLED simply states that electrons and holes are injected into an

electroluminescent polymer to emit light. This has nothing to do with a liquid conductive polymer that itself forms circuit devices after hardening. Therefore, the combination of Jacobsen and Verlinden does not satisfy the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 4-5, 10, 12 and 28-29

Claims 4-5, 10, 12 and 28-29, as amended, are patentable for reasons similar to those recited above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 6-9, 13, 22-27 and 30

These claims are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1, 4-5 and 12.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, claims 1-10, 12-13 and 22-30 are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

In the event additional fees are due as a result of this amendment, you are hereby authorized to charge such payment to Deposit Account No. 50-3718.

If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, then it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney at (425) 455-5575 to schedule an interview.

DATED this 13th day of October, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



J. Mark Han
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,898
155-108th Avenue N.E., Ste 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
(425) 455-5575